vss

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.5363 OF 2005

State Bank of India ... Petitioner

V/s.

Ravi Puravankar ... Respondent

Mr.P.N. Patwardhan i/b Bhave & Co. for Petitioner
Mr.Khan Javed Akhtar for Respondent

CORAM: **SMT.NISHITA MHATRE, J.**

DATED: **AUGUST 24, 2005**

P.C.:

. The Petitioner challenges the concurrent finding of facts of both the Courts below. The suit was for ejectment filed by the respondent on the ground that the petitioner was no longer a protected tenant in view of the provisions of the Maharashtra Rent Control Act, 1999. The suit has been decreed by holding that the Petitioner's tenancy was validly terminated and that it had lost protection afforded to it under the Bombay Rent Act. The appellate Court confirmed the finding of the trial Court.

2. Cross objections filed by the respondent were allowed. The Petitioner was directed to pay Rs.102,544

towards the difference in rent for the period from 1.9.1998 to 30.6.2001. This amount has already been paid by the Petitioner.

3. In my view, there is no need to interfere with concurrent finding of the facts and, therefore, Petition is rejected.

4. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner seeks some time to vacate the suit premises. Time to vacate the suit premises is granted for a period of one year from today on condition that the Petitioner files an undertaking in this Court in the usual terms within two weeks from today.